

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Young et al U.S. Patent No. 5,532,754 ("Young").

Claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,805,763 ("Lawler").

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

III. Applicants' Reply to the § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Young. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 15, is directed to a method and system for displaying television program listings on a screen. The television program listings are displayed as a grid of two-dimensional cells, where the channels are

displayed in a first dimension of the grid and time is displayed in the second dimension of the grid. An action control glyph is displayed "in a second area of the screen" (independent claims 1 and 15, emphasis added). A cell corresponding to one of the channels may be selected and the action control glyph may be activated by a user. In response to the activation of the action control glyph, the method and system rotate the grid of two-dimensional cells so that the one of the displayed plurality of channels is displayed in the second dimension and time is displayed in the first dimension (independent claims 1 and 15).

The Examiner contends that Young shows all of the features of applicants' independent claims 1 and 15. In particular, the Examiner points to col. 9, l. 65-col. 10, l. 18, and FIGS. 6-7 of Young.

Young is directed to a television schedule system for displaying the television schedule to the user as arrays of irregular cells forming a program grid (col. 4, ll. 50-55, col. 6, ll. 52-56). The system displays time on the horizontal axis of the grid, and the channels on the vertical axis of the grid (col. 6, ll. 52-56, FIG. 6). In response to toggling a user "What's On TV" command, the system displays a list for a single channel, where the channel number or name

is displayed on the horizontal axis, and time is displayed on the vertical axis (col 9, l. 65-col. 10, l. 2). The "What's on TV" command is provided to the system by a user selection of the "What's on TV" key on the remote controller (col. 16, l. 65-col. 17, l. 1, FIGS 8 and 21, emphasis added).

Although applicants' claimed invention may generally implicate the subject matter of Young, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 15 patentably improve upon Young by providing a method and system that rotate the grid of two-dimensional cells so that the one of the displayed plurality of channels is displayed in the second dimension and time is displayed in the first dimension in response to "activating the action control glyph" that is displayed "in a second area of the screen," (emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Young. Claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-14, 16-19, 23-26 and 28-29, which depend from respective independent claims 1 and 15, are also allowable over Young for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Young. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

IV. Applicants' Reply to the § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Lawler. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' dependent claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, dependent claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 are patentable over Young in view of Lawler for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Young. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection is therefore both moot and overcome, and respectfully request the rejection of claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-29 are allowable. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Reg. No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090